

REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment amends Claims 1, 73 and 99.

Applicants have received an Office Action dated December 29, 2004, which contains a requirement to restrict the present Application. In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute the Group I claims, namely Claims 1, 69 to 75, 99 and 100. The election is, however, made with traverse.

More particularly, traversal is on the ground that there would not be undue burden in examining the groups of claims in a single application. In particular, MPEP § 803 makes clear that in order to require restriction between independent or distinct inventions, reasons for insisting upon a restriction requirement, such as serious burden, must also be shown. In the present instance, it is not believed that there would be serious burden in examining the groups of claims in a single application, since they are not so different as would place a burden on the Examiner that is significantly beyond that of the normal burdens of examination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Carole A. Quinn
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 53416v1